



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,339	02/07/2002	Santhosh Kumaran	YOR920010613US1	6352

30743 7590 01/08/2008
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON & COOK, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

DESHPANDE, KALYAN K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/08/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/068,339

Applicant(s)

KUMARAN ET AL.

Examiner

Kalyan K. Deshpande

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 17-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/ are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. The following is a non-final office action in response to the communications received on October 15, 2007. Claims 1-6 and 17-19 are now pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicants' election of claims 1-6 and cancellation of claims 7-16 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-6 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-6 and 17-19 recite the step of "assembling an integrated user experience". It is unclear from the claim language and the specification what is encompassed by this step. For the purposes of examination, Examiner interprets this step to encompass providing access to the state of the workflow of ADOCs to the user.

Claims 1-6 and 17-19 also recite the use of "Adaptive Documents" (ADOCs). However, it is unclear from the specification how these documents are adaptive or what distinguishes ADOCs from a document of ordinary use. For the purposes of

examination, Examiner interprets ADOCs to include documents used for managing a workflow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020019797).

As per claim 1, Stewart teaches "a method for e-business solution assembly for process brokering and content aggregation in collaborative e-commerce comprising the steps of: supplying business process definitions" (see Stewart paragraphs 56, 59, 61, 79, and 84; where business processes are defined for the workflow system.) and "composing Adaptive Documents (ADOCs) for business collaboration by specifying valid application states for aggregated content and business, an ADOC linking content aggregated from various data sources to business processes and people and enabling collaborative business process management through orchestration of a variety of applications and user interactions in a context of a business process" (see Stewart paragraph 30, 84, 169-170 and 377; where a collaboration system interfaces with workflow systems to enable collaboration. The collaboration involves the use of multi-format messages, which is the same as an Adaptive Document. The workflow maintains the state using state diagrams. The collaboration system can be used in

conjunction with logic plug-ins which involve the use of a variety of applications.).

Stewart further discloses enabling users to interact with the collaboration messages (see Stewart paragraph 82) but fails to explicitly teach "assembling an integrated user experience through sequencing of ADOC views". Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well-known in the art to perform the step "assembling an integrated user experience through sequencing of ADOC views". The advantage of such a feature is that it promotes the ease of use of the software. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to modify Stewart to include the step of "assembling an integrated user experience through sequencing of ADOC views" in order to promote the ease of use of the software.

As per claim 2, Stewart teaches:

The method of claim 1, further comprising the step of formulating business objects that are referenced from the ADOCs (see Stewart paragraphs 71 and 282; where objects are referenced from the collaboration messages.).

As per claim 3, Stewart teaches:

The method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:
defining a set of messages (see Stewart paragraphs 25-28; where universal messages are defined.); and
generating application adapters to communicate with back-end systems using the set of messages to represent business data (see Stewart paragraphs 79-80; where an integrator (adapter) is used to communicate with back end systems through the use of messages.).

As per claim 4, Stewart teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein the step of composing ADOCs comprises the steps of:

specifying valid application states for aggregated content (see Stewart paragraph 30 and 377; where states are defined.); and

specifying business rules for orchestrating state transitions (see Stewart paragraphs 30, 132, 169, and 377; where rules are used to govern state transitions.).

As per claim 5, Stewart teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein interactions with said ADOCs is through programmatic means (see Stewart paragraphs 25-28 and 82-84; where programmed logic manipulates the collaboration messages.).

As per claim 6, Stewart teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein interactions with said ADOCs is through view-based human interactions (see Stewart paragraphs 25-28 and 82-84; where human users interact with the collaboration messages.).

As per claim 17, Stewart teaches:

The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of allowing clients to perform one or more creating, deleting, archiving, and restoring ADOCs (see Stewart paragraphs 25-28 and 82-84; where collaboration messages can be created, deleted, saved and accessed.).

As per claim 18, Stewart teaches:

The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of allowing clients to query the business state of the ADOC (see Stewart paragraphs 132, 169, and 377; where clients can view the state.).

As per claim 19, Stewart teaches:

The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of allowing a client to raise an event against a specific ADOC instance (see Stewart paragraphs 25-28, 82-84, and 146-147; where clients can initiate or terminate conversations. The initiation and termination are events against a specific collaboration message.).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following are pertinent to the current invention, though not relied upon:

Eicher et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020099580) teach a performance-based supply chain management system that provides a collaboration environment in which buyers and suppliers to a buyer-supplier engagement may collaborate regarding issues related to one or more key performance indicators identified for the buyer-supplier engagement.

Eichstaedt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020016725) teach systems and methods for the collaborative design, construction, and maintenance of fluid processing plants are provided. A collaborative commerce application may provide project management utilities, visualization utilities, dynamic pricing utilities, material procurement utilities, and certification utilities.

Lin et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020077919) teach a collaboration commerce method, which, with customers not knowing the whole collaboration commerce operation procedure, lowers the operation and executive costs among different supplier to achieve the optimal gains of collaboration commerce.

Stewart et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020010741) teach an enterprise wide electronic commerce system allows trading partners to act as participants in a complex trading process.

Seeberg et al. (Seeberg, Cornelia; El Saddik, Abdulmotaleb; Steinacker, Achim; Reichenberger, Klaus; Fischer, Stephan; Steinmetz, Ralf; "From the User's Needs to Adaptive Documents", *In Proceedings of the Integrated Design & Process Technology*, 2000) teach multiple web-based adaptive document systems.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kalyan K. Deshpande whose telephone number is (571) 272-5880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/068,339
Art Unit: 3623

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JONATHAN G. STERN
EXAMINER
AU 3623

/kkd/